

*Ancient Countries in Eastern India.*—By F. E. PARGITER, ESQ., B. A., C. S.

(With Map II.)\*

[ Read March, 1897. ]

The countries into which Eastern India was divided in ancient times consisted of four groups, (1) Magadha, Vidēha and the small kingdom of Vaiçālī; (2) Auṅga, Vaṅga, Kalinga, Puṇḍra and Suhma, with Ōḍra and Tāma-lipta; (3) Prāg-jyōtiṣa and the Kirātas; and (4) Utkala. The last three groups are always recognized in Sanskrit writings, and were without doubt based on real ethnological differences; but Magadha and Vidēha denoted territory rather than races, for these countries in their conditions resembled those to their west in Madhya-dēça, viz., Kōsala and Kāçi, and their inhabitants appear, especially in Magadha, to have been a mixture of the Āryas with earlier races, as in Madhya-dēça, the chief difference being that the earlier races do not seem to have been so completely subjugated and incorporated by the Āryas as in Madhya-dēça.

I propose in this paper to collect and examine all the passages of any importance, that I have been able to find, bearing on these countries, and to determine their position as exactly as possible. In a map illustrating the paper on “Ancient Cēdi, Matsya and Karūṣa” in this Journal, Vol. LXIV, Part I, No. 3, 1895, I have shown nearly all these countries in the positions which I proposed in the notes to the Translation of the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, cantos lvii and lviii; but on fuller and more careful consideration I have been led to modify those views somewhat, especially with regard to Puṇḍra, and would offer the present paper as a revised contribution to the ancient geography of Eastern India.

Most of the passages cited here are taken from that vast storehouse of information, the Mahā-Bhārata, and therefore in giving the references I have dropped the name of the book for the sake of convenience and specified the Parvans only. For passages cited from other books the references have been given in full, and the Rāmāyaṇa is quoted according to Gorresio’s Edition.

\* It is not free from blemishes; e.g., for *Modagiri* read *Mōdāgiri*; for *Tr-srotas* read *Tri-srōtas*; &c.

## MAGADHA.

Magadha is too well known to call for much notice here. It comprised the modern districts of Patna, Gaya and Shāhābād. Its ancient capital was Giri-vraja (Sabhā-p., xx. 798-800; Hari-V., cxvii. 6598; and Rāmāyaṇa, Ādi-k., xxxv. 1-9), which Cunningham has identified with the modern Giryek on the Pañcana river about 36 miles north-east of Gayā (Arch. Surv. Repts., I. 16 and plate iii). Rāja-gṛha appears to have been another name of the capital (Ādi-p., cxiii. 4451-2; and Āçvamēdh.-p., lxxxii. 2435-63), but Cunningham identifies it with the modern Raj-gir about six miles west of Giryek (Arch. Surv. Repts., I. 20 and plate iii). The people were called Magadhas and Māga-dhas.

Magadha appears to have been the arena of many early conflicts. Its oldest name is said to have been Kikaṭa, which occurs in Ṛg.-V., iii. 53.14 (Muir's Sansk. Texts, II. 362-3). In the Rāmāyaṇa, Viçvā-mitra gives the youthful Rāma an account of Magadha and the countries near it. He says its old name was Vasu; Kuça, a great king who was sprung from Brahmā, had four sons who established four kingdoms, (1) Kuçāçva at Kauçāçvi (or, Kuçāmba at Kauçāmbi, according to another reading), (2) Kuçanābha at Mahodaya or Kānyakubja, (3) Amūrtarajas in Prāg-jyōtiṣa, and (4) Vasu at Giri-vraja (Ādi-k., xxxv. 1-10 and 35). This story professes to hand down what occurred several generations before Rāma's time, but presents many difficulties, and clashes in some of its details with the next event that I now cite. According to the Mahā-Bhārata, at a later time about half way between Rāma's age and that of the Pāṇḍavas, Vasu Upari-cara, king of Cēdi, conquered Magadha and established his son Vṛhad-ratha as king over it (see paper on "Ancient Cēdi, Matsya and Karūṣa" mentioned above).

The later history of Magadha is well-known, and it played the leading part in Buddhism.

## VIDĒHA.

Vidēha derived its name from Māthava the Vidēgha who colonized it according to the Çata-P. Brāhmaṇa (I. iv. 1). The passage runs thus, briefly, according to Dr. Eggeling's translation. "Māthava, the (king of) Vidēgha, carried Agni Vaiçvānara in his mouth. The Ṛṣi Gōtama Rābhūgaṇa was his family priest. When addressed (by the latter) he made no answer to him, fearing lest Agni might fall from his mouth. [The priest continued to invoke Agni, and at length Agni Vaiçvānara flashed forth from the king's mouth and fell down on the earth.] Māthava the Vidēgha was at that time on the river Sarasvatī.

He (Agni) thence went burning along this earth towards the east; and Gôtama Rāhūgaṇa and the Vidēgha Māthava followed after him as he was burning along. He burnt over (dried up) all these rivers. Now that (river) which is called Sadā-nirā flows from the northern (Himālaya) mountain; that one he did not burn over. That one the brāhmins did not cross in former times, thinking it has not been burnt over by Agni Vaiçvānara. Now-a-days, however, there are many brāhmins to the east of it. At that time it (the land east of the Sadā-nirā) was very uncultivated, very marshy, because it had not been tasted by Agni Vaiçvānara. Now-a-days, however, it is very cultivated, for the brāhmins have caused (Agni) to taste it through sacrifices. Even in late summer that (river), as it were, rages along; so cold is it, not having been burnt over by Agni Vaiçvānara. Māthava the Vidēgha then said (to Agni), 'Where am I to abide?' 'To the east of this river be thy abode!' said he. Even now this river forms the boundary of the Kōsalas and Vidēhas; for these are the Māthavas."

Sadā-nirā means "the river that is always full of water." Sāyana says it is the river Karatōyā, the modern Kurattee which flows through the Bogra district; and Dr. Muir (Sansk. Texts, II. 419-422) and Dr. Eggeling (see note in his edition) prefer to identify it with the Gaṇḍakī, the modern Gaṇḍak. Sāyana's explanation must be mistaken, because there can be no doubt Vidēha could never have been east of the Kurattee. Nor can the river be well identified with the Gaṇḍakī, because they are mentioned as distinct rivers in Sabhā-p., xix. 794. This passage is noticed by Dr. Muir. Though it is hardly intelligible in its description of the route taken by Kṛṣṇa, Arjuna and Bhīma in going from the Kurus to Magadha, unless they took a zigzag course eastward, south-westward and again eastward, in order to avert suspicion before finally making for Magadha; still it indicates plainly that the Gaṇḍakī and Sadā-nirā were different rivers. Moreover the Gaṇḍakī flows *through* the country which has always been considered to be Vidēha, and could not therefore have been its western boundary.

It seems then that the Sadā-nirā must lie further to the west, and it should probably be identified with the Rapti. I have not been able to find any Sanskrit name for the Rapti. Lassen calls it the Ajita-vatī (Ind. Alt., Map), but this name is not in the dictionary, nor have I met with it anywhere. This identification then fills up a blank and agrees with the well-known situation of Vidēha. It offers also an explanation of the marshy nature of ancient Vidēha, *viz.*, the Gaṇḍak flows through the middle of the country, it has always been liable to shift its course greatly, its numerous channels intersect the country, and its floods would have rendered the soil extremely marshy.

A further consideration of the facts will, I think, throw some light on this passage from the Çata-P. Brāhmaṇa. Vidēha in ancient times must, like most other parts of India, have been more or less covered by forest, the remains of which survive at the present day along the foot of the Himālayas in the tract called the Terai, and was no doubt inhabited by aboriginal tribes such as inhabit the Terai now. The deadly malaria of such a forest is well-known, and only such tribes have been able to live in its climate. To this must be added the effect, which periodic floods from the Gaṇḍak during the rainy season must have produced in the rank vegetation of such a region. Very swampy and uncultivable would be moderate expressions to apply to it. No Ārya could have ventured within it, and the only way in which Āryas could have colonized it was by felling and burning the forest down wholesale, and opening out the soil to the purifying rays of the sun. That is what (it seems to be implied) Māthava must have done.

Prof. Weber considers Agni Vaiçvānara to be a personification of the sacrificial worship of the brāhmans, and Dr. Muir and Dr. Eggeling appear to acquiesce in this interpretation (*loc. cit.*); but I venture to submit that the wide import of the epithet Agni *Vaiçvānara*, "the fire that burns for all men," hardly expresses the narrow view that the brāhmans would have of their own peculiar sacrificial fire. May it not rather mean "fire which is the common property of all men," that is, not sacrificial fire, but fire in its ordinary every-day uses as applied to human wants? It seems to me a distinction is implied between the Agni *Vaiçvānara* that Māthava himself had and the sacrificial fire of the brāhmans.

The explanation suggested here, regarding Agni *Vaiçvānara*'s going burning along the ground and his tasting and improving the soil, portrays with poetical force, how the fire seized on the forests and raged along devouring them with its flames, and how it licked and scorched the pestilential soil, and so laid the marshy ground bare to the sun's parching heat.<sup>1</sup> The races who preceded the Āryas appear to have been forest tribes. Agni must have cleared away the primeval forests from the Sarasvatī to the Sadā-nīrā, and there the course of the colonizing Āryas stopped, until (as seems implied) Māthava carried Agni on to the east of the latter river. It seems highly

<sup>1</sup> It is in the light of this explanation that I would interpret the curious statement in *Sabhā-p.*, xxix. 1078, which Dr. Muir notices (*loc. cit.*), that Bhīma in his conquest of Eastern India went to a *jalōdbhava* country bordering on Himavat (*tatō Himavataḥ pārçvam samabhyētya jalōdbhavam*). In such a connexion *jalōdbhava* surely cannot mean "of aqueous or oceanic origin," but might well mean "reclaimed from swamp."

probable the forest tribes were not acquainted with fire. They shun the bright life of the open country, and would have retreated terrified and silent into the depths of the forest; and it is noteworthy that no mention is made of any fighting before Māthava established himself there.

It has pleased the brāhmins in this passage to ascribe the improvement in the land to their sacrifices, but the passage implies, as Prof. Weber observes, that they did not venture across the Sadā-nirā till Māthava with his devouring fire had cleansed the ground before them. I would therefore suggest that we have here described how Māthava, with no doubt his comrades, burnt the forest down and began cultivating the land, and how the brāhmins, finding the new tract developing into a good land, followed afterwards and soon appropriated the merit to themselves and their sacrifices. I venture to commend this explanation to those who know the country.

Vidēha then comprised the country from Gorakhpur on the Rapti to Darbhanga, with Kōsala on the west and Anga on the east. On the north it approached the hills, and on the south it was bounded by the small kingdom of Vaiçālī. Its capital was called Mithilā (Çānti-p., cccxxvii. 12233-8; and Rāmāy., Ādi-k., xlix. 9-16); and this name often designated the country itself, especially in the Rāmāyaṇa. The people were called Vidēhas, Vaidēhakas and also Mithilas (Vana-p., ccliii. 15243). Its kings traced their descent from Nimi (Rāmāy., Ādi-k., lxxiii. 2-12) and were generally called Janaka, which seems to have been the ordinary royal title (Vana-p., cxxxiii. 10637). They were often highly educated (Çānti-p., cccxxvii. 12215-25; Kauṣītakī Up., iv. 1; Bṛhad-Āraṇ. Up., II. i. 1, and IV. i. and ii.). Cunningham says the capital was Janakpur, which is now a small town just within the Nepal border, north of where the Muzaffarpur and Darbhanga districts meet (Arch. Surv. Repts., XVI. 34, and map), but I have not met this name in Sanskrit works, and it is not in the dictionary.

#### THE KINGDOM OF VAIÇĀLĪ.

Between Magadha and Vidēha lay a small kingdom on the north side of the Ganges, with its capital at Vaiçālī, for Viçvāmitra, when taking the youthful Rāma from the slaughter of Tāḍakā in the Shāhābād district to Mithilā, stopped at Vaiçālī on the way. Their route appears from the Rāmāyaṇa to have been as follows: crossing the R. Çōṇa or Sone from the Shāhābād district and travelling north-east they reached the Ganges near the site of the present city Patna (Ādi-k., xxxvii. 1-7); and then crossing the Ganges by boat, and travelling northwards towards Mithilā the whole of one day, they reached Vaiçālī

at evening (*id.*, xlvi. 5-11; xlvi. 21-25; and xlix. 1-8). This agrees with the situation of the modern town Besarh, 27 miles north and a little east of Patna, which Cunningham has identified with Vaiçālī (Arch. Surv. Repts., I. 55, and XVI. 6 and 34).

No name appears to be given to this country and it plays a very small part in Sanskrit writings. Its kings claimed descent from Ikṣvāku, the founder of the Solar dynasty of Ayōdhyā, and called themselves all Ikṣvākus (Rāmāy., Ādi-k., xlvi. 13-20). In the Buddhist writings the country is called Vṛji (Mahāvamsa, early chapters; and Arch. Surv. Repts., XVI. 34), but this name is not in the Sanskrit dictionary nor have I met with it in any Sanskrit work. It played however an important part in early Buddhist history, for Buddha is said to have announced his approaching Nirvāṇa at Vaiçālī, and the second Buddhist Synod was held there.

#### THE SECOND GROUP OF FIVE NATIONS.

The Aṅgas, Vaṅgas, Kalingas, Puṇdras and Suhmas were habitually classed together, and the first two, with the third often added, are generally found linked together, partly no doubt because they were neighbouring nations, but chiefly it seems because the names made a jingle. They are stated in the legends and genealogies to have been the descendants of five brothers of the same names, Aṅga, Vaṅga, Kalinga, Puṇdra and Suhma, who were the sons of king Bali's queen Sudēṣṇā by the ṛṣi Dīrgha-tamas or Dīrgha-tapas. The accounts vary somewhat, but agree in this—that the ṛṣi (who had been blind from his birth in consequence of a curse) was abandoned on a raft in the Ganges, was carried down the stream and was rescued by king Bali, and that Bali who wanted children commissioned his queen and the ṛṣi to raise up offspring for him. The story is told with much circumstantial detail, as if it was a well known event, and it is said these five sons were called “Bālēya-kṣētra” and even “Bālēya brāhmins,” though Bali himself is called a Dānava (Ādi-p., civ. 4179-4221; Hari-V., xxxi. 1682-97; Matsya Pur., xlvi. 23-78; and Viṣṇu Pur., iv. 18). Bali is styled “king of the East,” and is shown in the genealogies as a descendant of Titikṣu, king of the East; but Titikṣu's descent is uncertain for the Hari-Vamṇa traces it from Pūru king of Madhya or the Middle region (xxx. i.), and the Viṣṇu and Matsya Purāṇas from Anu, king of the East (*e. g.*, Matsya Pur., xlvi. i.).

Statements, like this one regarding these five brothers, that a certain person was the progenitor of a certain people, occur frequently in Sanskrit genealogies and legends. They do not invite ready belief, and their meaning is a matter of uncertainty and difficulty, but looked at in

the light of history they may admit of one probable interpretation. It is a trite saying that history repeats itself, and certainly one feature that appears in all ages of Indian history is the course of conquest. A handful of strangers have invaded a part of the country, conquered the old inhabitants and established themselves in it, their leader as king and themselves as the aristocratic class; and the contest has rarely been an internecine one, unless religion or patriotism has been involved in it. The earliest struggles, in which the Āryas fought their way into India, seem to have been rendered fiercer by the strong religious and social differences between them and the aboriginal races; but after the time when the Āryas established themselves in Madhya-dēça, and universal respect was accorded to them because of their chivalry and prestige, it is hard to find traces of a fierce struggle between them and the aborigines except in the story of Rāma and Rāvaṇa. The Āryas, being the dominant race, considered themselves, and were esteemed by the other nations, as the elite of India. Those nations gradually imitated them and adopted their customs. What happened then between the Āryas and aborigines may no doubt be compared to what is happening now between the English and the natives in South Africa.

Ṛṣis and ascetics exerted a strong influence towards extending the Aryan supremacy. They wandered through every country in ancient India, and established themselves in every spot, where the bracing air of the hills or the cool temperature of a well-watered shady wood attracted them and induced them to linger. In this way they became pioneers of the religion and civilization of the Āryas, and afford a strange parallel to the part which Christian missionaries have played in extending British influence over barbarous countries. Where the ascetics were received with favour and reverence, they soon brought the people of their new country more or less effectually within the pale of Aryanism, as in the case of the ṛṣi Dīrgha-tamas; but where they were harassed or cut off, their sufferings and complaints brought retribution on the offending nation, as in Rāma's slaughter of the so-called Rākṣasas in Jana-sthāna on the Gōdāvarī, which is commemorated in simple and grateful terms in Drōṇa-p., lix. 2226-7; and no doubt to somewhat similar incidents must be assigned the frequent yet vague mention of wars in which kings aided the gods against the demons.

In the same direction tended ancient sentiments regarding marriage. In early times the rules restricting inter-marriage between different classes were very easy, if indeed it can be said there were any definite prohibitions of that kind. The Mahā-Bhārata is full of instances of mixed unions, which were manifestly regarded at the time as involving no slur or stain, and the ṛṣi Dīrgha-tamas is said to have bestowed his

favours freely and indiscriminately, and to have left a numerous progeny of various ranks in Anṅga and Magadha, not only without incurring any reprobation but even with emphatic approval and blessing from Surabhi (Matsya Pur., xlviii. 60–63 and 79–84; and also Sabhā-p., xx. 802 with Ādi-p., civ. 4193–4216). The result of such practices must have been an infusion of Aryan blood into the populace and the growth of classes, which (like the Eurasians of the present day) would have sought to connect themselves more with the Aryan aristocracy than with their aboriginal kindred; and it would not be an altogether unreasonable and extravagant assertion to say that, in countries where an extensive blending of that sort occurred, the people were descended from the invading leader who founded a new dynasty or territorial sovereignty.

Looked at in this way the story may therefore possibly be true that five brothers Anṅga, Vajra, Kalinga, Puṇḍra and Suhma may have conquered five countries, established five kingdoms, and given their names to their countries and the inhabitants; but it cannot be pushed beyond this, nor can they have been the progenitors of the bulk of the people, because the genealogies make king Lōma-pāda, who was the contemporary of Daṅga-ratha and Rāma, only the fifth or sixth descendant of Anṅga; and because it is impossible that the country of Anṅga could have been uninhabited before Anṅga's time, or that his descendants could have extirpated the previous inhabitants or filled the country themselves in so short a time.

There is, however, one serious objection to this explanation, *viz.*, there is no mention that these countries had any other names prior to the age of these five brothers, and they bear the same names in the earliest allusions. The two most prominent of these countries in the most ancient times were Anṅga and Kalinga, and the earliest references to them occur, I believe, in the marriages of kings of the Lunar dynasty with princesses of these countries (*e.g.*, Ādi-p., xcv. 3772–80). From the general tenor of the old stories, and according to the genealogies if they are traced downward from Pūru or Anu, it appears incontestable that those kings belonged to a prior time (*e.g.*, see the two lines of Ṛcēyu and Kakṣēyu in Hari-V., xxxi. and xxxii.); but if the genealogies are reckoned upwards from the Pāṇḍavas' time, this inference is much weakened, so that it does not seem absolutely impossible the founding of Anṅga and Kalinga may have been earlier than those kings, and thus the difficulty might disappear. Otherwise it may be, supposing there is truth in this story of the five brothers, that, if Anṅga was really the later name, it superseded the ancient name so completely that it was substituted for the ancient name in the genealogies; for it seems a



reasonable supposition that (apart from the deliberate fabrication of genealogies for the purpose of gratifying vanity, ambition or religious arrogance) all ancient genealogies and legends would be gradually modified by the substitution of current words in lieu of obsolete words, in order to render them intelligible to new generations and without any intention to falsify them.

The estimation in which these five nations were held by the brāhmans of Madhya-dēça varied remarkably. The curious harangue in which Karṇa abused Çalya, king of Madra, and Çalya's retort (Karṇa-p., xl.-xlv.) disclose some strange and inconsistent remarks on the composition and character of various races in India, which no doubt represent the handiwork of different authors and ages.

Çalya asserts that it was the custom in Aṅga to abandon the sick and sell one's wife and children (xlv. 2112); and in one passage it is said that the Kalingas should be shunned as unrighteous, together with certain other people picked here and there out of Southern and Western India (xliv. 2066-7). Yet in other passages it is said—the Aṅgakas (Aṅgas) and Māgadhas when old live according to the rules of righteousness which they have learnt (xlv. 2101); and Paṇḍras, Kālingas and Māgadhas are held up to honour along with the people of Madhya-dēça as being conversant with eternal righteousness (xlv. 2084-5).

Originally these nations did not belong to the Aryan stock; they appear to have been mlēcchas. The story of the five brothers no doubt indicates that these nations were brought within the Aryan pale, yet they did not rank high, for even at the time of the Great War the Aṅga prince is styled a mlēccha (Karṇa-p., xxii. 877 and 880), and if such a term could be applied to him, when Aṅga was the foremost of these nations, it is certain the others must have been in a lower plight. The elevation of the Aṅgas, Kalingas and Paṇḍras to the same degree of esteem, which the nations of Madhya-dēça enjoyed, must be a later development, and be the sign of some marked change which passed over Northern India. The alteration is most marked in the estimation of the Kalingas. Does it represent the opinion of the age when Brahmanism hard-pushed by Buddhism found a refuge in Orissa?

The Aitarēya Brāhmaṇa says the Paṇḍras, the Andhras and certain rude tribes in Central India are most degraded; they were Viçvāmitra's descendants and were reduced to that state by his curse (vii. 3. 18). Manu says, the Paṇḍrakas, Ōḍras and Drāviḍas and various well-known nations on the northern and north-western confines of India were kṣattriyas and sank gradually to the rank of Çūdras by reason of the neglect of sacred rites and the absence of brāhmans (x. 43-4.)

These statements seem to represent an intermediate opinion of doctrinaire speculation, or the dogmatism of a late and ignorant period.

We may now consider the position of these five countries and their extent.

#### ANĠA.

The position of Anġa is well-known and requires only a few remarks. It was at all times closely connected with Magadha. The kings of Anġa and Vanġa used to frequent Dirgha-tamas' or Gautama's dwelling at Giri-vraja (Sabhā-p., xx. 802-4; and the passages cited above regarding Dirgha-tamas; and Ćānti-p., cccxliii. 13183-5). The famous king Anġa Vṛhad-ratha sacrificed on Mt. Viṣṇupada, which appears to be a hill at Gayā (Ćānti-p., xxix. 924-31). Jarāsandha king of Magadha bestowed the city Mālinī, the capital of the Anġas, on Karṇa as a fief (*id.*, v). It adjoined Magadha on the east as appears from the description of Bhīma's conquests in the Eastern region, which is quoted here as it will serve to elucidate the position of the other eastern nations considered in this paper.

Marching from Magadha, Bhīma conquered Karṇa (king of Anġa) in battle and brought him into subjection. Then he vanquished the kings who dwelt in the hills. Next he slew a very powerful king in battle at Mōdāgiri. Then he conquered Vāsudēva, the mighty king of Puṇḍra, and the valiant king who dwelt in Kauṣikī-kaccha, both powerful heroes, both fierce in prowess. He attacked the king of Vanġa. Conquering Samudra-sēna and king Candra-sēna (who appear to have been kings of Vanġa), and the Tāmralipta king and the lord of Karvaṭa, he vanquished also the lord of the Suhmas, and those who dwell beside the sea, and all the tribes (*gaṇa*) of Mlēcchas. Then he went to Lauhitya. He made all the kings, who dwell in the marshy tracts near the sea (*sāgarānūpa*), pay tribute (Sabhā-p., xxix. 1094-1100).

This description appears unusually clear and natural. Marching from the Patna and Gaya districts Bhīma met and defeated Karṇa on the western limits of Anġa, that is, in the west of the Monghyr or Mungir district; then turning aside and subduing the petty kings in the northern part of Chutia Nagpur, he marched on eastward to Mōdāgiri. Lassen has identified Mōdāgiri with the modern town of Monghyr or Mungir; this is extremely probable both from the resemblance of the names and from the situation and natural features of the town. Mōdāgiri or (nasalized, as so frequently happens in Indian vernaculars) Mōndāgiri might easily be corrupted into Mungir. The king of this place would then have been one of Karṇa's vassals.

The capital was called Mālinī or Mālina at first, and this name was superseded by that of Campā bestowed on the city in honour (it

is said) of Lōma-pāda's great grandson, king Campa (Çānti-p., v. 134-5; Hari-V., xxxi. 1699-1700; and Matsya Pur., xlvi. 97); but the latter name is often used indiscriminately in regard to time, and the city is called Campā in an account of Lōma-pāda's reign (Rāmāy., Ādi-k., xvii. 23). It was situated on the Ganges (Vana-p., lxxxv. 8156; and cccvii. 17150-51), and is identified with the modern town of Bhāgalpur.

Cunningham says Mudgala-puri, Mudgalāçrama and Mudga-giri were the old names of Mungir; and an earlier name was Kaṣṭa-haraṇa-parvata (Arch. Surv. Repts., XV. 15 and 18). Madgurakas are mentioned as a people in Eastern India (Matsya Pur., cxiii. 44), and Mudakaras (Mārkaṇḍ.Pur., lvii. 42); probably the correct reading should be Mudagiras. The Mudgalas are cursorily mentioned in Droṇa-p., xi. 397. None of these names, however, can well be older than Mōdāgiri in the Mahā-Bhārata.

Aṅga therefore comprised the modern districts of Bhāgalpur and Monghyr, and also extended northwards up the river Kauçikī, the modern Kosi, and included the western portion of the district of Purnia. For it was on that river that Kāçyapa Vibhāṇḍaka had his hermitage, there his son Ṛṣyaçṛṅga was brought up in the strictest seclusion, and from there the young ṛṣi was beguiled by a courtesan of Mālinī into a boat and brought down the river to the capital (Vana-p., cx. 9990-10080; and Rāmāy., Ādi-k., viii. and ix.). The forest in which Ṛṣyaçṛṅga lived is said to have bordered on Aṅga (Ādi-k., ix. 55-61), and the whole of this quaint story implies that he was living within the territory of Aṅga, for no embassy was sent to any other king for permission to bring him away, as when Daça-ratha paid a special visit to Lōma-pāda to invite the ṛṣi's attendance at Ayōdhyā to perform the sacrifice which was to bless the king with a son (*id.*, x. 14-23).

The tract near Campā was called Sūta-viṣaya, "the land of bards or charioteers." It was there that Karṇa, Kuntī's illegitimate son, was adopted and brought up by the Sūta Adhi-ratha (Ādi-p., lxvii. 2764-83, and cxi.; and Vana-p., cccvii. 17150-51, and cccviii).

Aṅga was a kingdom from very early times, for it is said that Ariha, the eighth descendant from Pūru, married Aṅgī or Āṅgī, and his fifth descendant who bore the same name married Āṅgēyī, both presumably Aṅga princesses (Ādi-p., xc. 3772 and 3777). And Vasuhōma is mentioned as king of Aṅga contemporary with the great Māndhātr, one of the early kings of the Solar race, and is eulogized in high terms (Çānti-p., cxxii). Passages such as these present difficulties as noticed above, and are also open to distrust as being fabrications of a later age, but there are these considerations in favour of their genuineness and authenticity, namely, that in all countries and especi-

ally in ancient times genealogies have been esteemed matters of very great importance and kept up with jealous pride, and that Anṅa lay at first outside the Aryan pale, so that no honour could be gained by alleging false alliances with its princes who were prior to the time of Anṅa. In Jarāsandha's time, Anṅa appears to have been an appanage of Magadha, and it was through his favour that Karṇa gained it as his kingdom (Sabhā-p., xxix. 1090-93; Vana-p., ccxlv. 15052; and Çānti-p., v. 134-5).

The ancient history of Anṅa appears to consist of two periods, first, the age before the eponymous king Anṅa, and secondly that which he inaugurated. In the former age the country must have belonged to a pre-Aryan race and dynasty, and their rule must have ended with king Bali. Although his lineage is traced up to Anu or Pūru, sons of Yayāti, so as to connect it with the royal Aryan lines of North India, yet he is called a Dānava (Matsya Pur., xlvi. 60), and it was no doubt a remembrance of its old non-Aryan stock that led to the application of the opprobrious term Mleccha to the Anṅa prince who joined in the Great war (Karṇa-p., xxii. 877 and 880).

The second period no doubt represents the change when the country passed under the influence of the Āryas, as they extended their dominion eastward. It has been mentioned already that Daça-ratha's contemporary Lōma-pāda was fifth or sixth in descent from Anṅa, hence the beginning of this period may be placed some six generations prior to Rāma's time. There was a close friendship between Lōma-pāda and Daça-ratha, so genuine that the latter is said to have given his daughter Çāntā in adoption to the former (Rāmāy., Ādi-k., x. 1-10, and 23-27). The connexion between Ayōdhyā and Anṅa at that time is shewn in such detail and referred to so often, that it appears to be a real historical fact; and it is corroborated incidentally in a remarkable manner in the enumeration of the kings and princes who were invited to attend Daça-ratha's sacrifice (*id.*, xii. 18-24). That list differs surprisingly from similar lists in the Mahā-Bhārata, which describe all the kings and princes through the length and breadth of India, who assembled at Draupadī's svayam-vara (Ādi-p., clxxxvi. and clxxxvii.), at the opening of the Pāṇḍavas' Court (Sabhā-p., iv.), and at the Rāja-sūya sacrifice (*id.*, xxxiii.). The Rāmāyaṇa list is short and is noteworthy as much for its omissions as for its contents; it mentions the kings of Mithilā (North Behar), Kāçi (Benares), Kēkaya (North Panjab) and Anṅa, and then in general terms those of the East (prācya), of Sindhu (North Sindh) and Sauvīra (West Panjab), of Su-rāṣṭra (Gujarat) and of the Dekhan, and "whatever other kings were particularly friendly" (Ādi-k., xii. 18-24). Madhya-dēça is ignored with the exception of

Kāçi; and the connexions of Kōsala and Ayōdhyā were closest with Kāçi, Mithilā and Aṅga, and after them with the distant kingdoms of the Panjab and Western India.

The Aitarēya Brāhmaṇa says that Aṅga was inaugurated with the Mahābhiṣēka ceremony by Udamaya son of Atri, and in consequence conquered the whole earth; and that Aṅga gave him a thousand elephants in the country Avacatnuka (viii. 4, 22). This passage probably refers to Aṅga Vṛhad-ratha, one of the sixteen famous kings (Çānti-p., xxix. 924-31) who seems to be the same as Dharma-ratha, the great grandson of Aṅga, from the special allusion to Mt. Viṣṇu-pada (Hari-V., xxxi. 1693-5); but I have not met the name Avacatnuka elsewhere, nor is it in the dictionary.

#### VANGA.

Vaṅga or Baṅga is often mentioned and its people were called Vaṅgas and Vaṅgēyas; but the allusions seldom yield any clear information. As shewn in the description of Bhīma's conquests in the Eastern region quoted above, it lay beyond Aṅga, to the south-east, and was the original of the modern Bengal.

The only definite information occurs in a passage in the Raghuvamṣa which of course belongs to a comparatively late date (iv. 36 and 37). The Vaṅgas are described there as essentially a boating people, using boats for all purposes of life (*nau-sādhana*), and as growing rice for their staple crop, which they uprooted when seedlings and transplanted into their fields, as they do to this day. Raghu planted his columns of victory in the islands of the Ganges delta, *gaṅgā-srōtō-ntarēṣu*. It is difficult to say at what rate land has been forming in the delta, yet it is clear from this description that, apart from its extent sea-ward, the delta must have differed greatly from its present condition 1200 or 1500 years ago. The rivers which traverse it now are partially silted up, but at that time they must have been wide and free-flowing streams, dividing the lands into numerous distinct islands; in fact, the condition of the whole delta then must have been very much like what the extreme south-eastern portion is now.

Vaṅga must have comprised the modern districts of Murshidabad, Nadia, Jessor, and parts of Rajshahi, Pabna and Faridpur.

Vaṅga occupied a much lower position than Aṅga or Kalinga; I have found no mention of any marriages between its princes or princesses and the royal families of North India. Its kings are spoken of in general terms and names are seldom mentioned. A prince Caudra-sēna, son of Samudra-sēna, attended Draupadi's svayam-vara (Ādi-p., clxxxvi. 6991), and it appears probable on comparing this passage with the description of Bhīma's conquests quoted above, that these two persons

were princes of Vāṅga. It seems likely that this Samudra-sēna is the king of the same name who was famed as far as the confines of the sea (*id.*, lxvii. 2690). No capital appears to be even alluded to.

#### KALINGA.

Kaliṅga is generally ranked third in this five-fold group of countries, but resembled Aṅga in being a settled kingdom with a capital, and in having a longer history than the rest.

The fullest and clearest information is given in a passage of the *Raghu-Vaṁṣa* (iv. 38-43) describing Raghu's conquests. After conquering the Vāṅgas, Raghu crossed the Kapiṣā (or Karabhā, according to another reading) by bridging it with his elephants, and took the road pointed out by the Utkala kings towards Kaliṅga. He planted his own splendour on the summit of Mount Mahēndra as a mahaut strikes his iron hook into the head of an unruly elephant. The Kaliṅga king with an array of elephants attacked him, but Raghu withstanding the storm of arrows defeated his foes there (at Mt. Mahēndra). His soldiers made open spaces for revelry and quaffed fermented cocoa-nut juice out of betel-leaves. Observing the rules of fair warfare, he took from the lord of Mahēndra his glory but not his territory.

Lassen has identified the R. Kapiṣā with the modern Subarṇa-rēkhā on the confines of the Midnapur and Balasore districts (*Ind. Alt.*, Map), but I venture to suggest that the Kapiṣā is the modern Cossye or Kansai, which flows a little further north through Midnapur. The name Kansai is said to be modified from Kamsavati, but I do not know on what authority, nor have I met with this name anywhere, nor is it in the dictionary. Kansai or Kamsai may easily be a corruption of Kapiṣā-vati; names of this form are not uncommon, *e.g.*, Amarā-vati, Utpalā-vati.

This passage shows that Kaliṅga lay southward of Vāṅga beyond the R. Kapiṣā, and stretched southward so as to include Mount Mahēndra. The Mahēndra Mountains were one of the seven chief ranges of India, and are the northern portion of the Eastern Ghats above the R. Godāvāri, and the hills near Ganjam are still called Mahindra. It is not stated that the Kapiṣā was the northern limit of Kaliṅga; rather the above passage suggests that Utkala jutted in between this river and Kaliṅga, and that Raghu secured the help and guidance of the Utkala kings in order to reach Kaliṅga. The northern limit of Kaliṅga was approximately the river Vaitaraṇī, the modern Bytarni; for the *Mahā-Bhārata*, describing the Pāṇḍavas' pilgrimage to all the tīrthas, says—After bathing at the junction of the Ganges and the sea, they travelled along the sea-coast towards the Kaliṅgas, and reached that people and the R. Vaitaraṇī about the same time; its northern bank is spoken of as

greatly frequented by ṛṣis (Vana-p., cxiv. 10096–10107). On its bank was Viraja-tīrtha, the later Birajā-kṣētra, the modern Jajpur (*id.*, lxxxv. 8148).

Kaliṅga therefore comprised modern Orissa about as far north as the modern town Bhadrak in the Balasore district, and the sea-coast southward as far as Vizagapatam; it does not appear to have reached as far as the Godāvāri, because this river is never connected with Kaliṅga in any passage as far as I am aware. Its limits inland are not clear. Kaliṅga as a settled country appears to have consisted properly of the plain between the Eastern Ghats and the sea, yet its monarchs seem to have exercised a kind of suzerainty over the aboriginal tribes which inhabited the hilly tracts far inland, for the Amara-kaṅṭaka hills, in which the Narmadā rises, are said to be in the western part of Kaliṅga (Kūrma Pur., II. xxxix. 9). Lassen places Kaliṅga along the inner side of the Eastern Ghats from the Vizagapatam district southward as far as the Karnul district.

The capital is called Rāja-pura, which however simply means “capital” (Çānti-p., iv). In the Raghu-Vaṁṣa it is placed on the sea-coast, and the palace is described as being so near the sea, that the windows looked out on the sea, and the deep roar of the waves drowned the bray of trumpets (vi. 56). This description can only apply to Kalingapatam, and that town was no doubt the capital in Kālidāsa’s time. Kalingapatam and Chicacole (said to be corrupted from Çrī-kākōla) are reputed to be the two ancient capitals, and the latter is said to be the more ancient (Arch. Surv. of S. India, by R. Sewell, I. 2 and 7), but I have not met the name Çrī-kākōla anywhere, nor is it in the dictionary.

The people were called Kaliṅga, Kāliṅga and Kāliṅgaka; and “all the Kaliṅgas” are spoken of as if they were a numerous people (Bhīṣma-p., xvii. 668; and lxxi. 3132). Their kingdom dates back to very early times. Three famous kings are named, Kṣēma, Agra-tīrtha and Kuhara (Ādi-p., lxvii. 2701), and their princesses married two of the early kings of the Lunar dynasty (*id.*, xcv. 3775 and 3780). Duryodhana moreover attended a svayam̐-vara held by a Kaliṅga princess, and carried her off with Karṇa’s help (Çānti-p., iv). Kṛṣṇa is said to have crushed the Kaliṅgas in a pitched battle at a place called Dantakūra (Udyoga-p., xlvii. 1883); it is not clear where that place was, but it may be noticed that Rāma Jāmadagnya slew the kṣatriyas and the haters of the brāhmins and Dantakrūra (Droṇa-p., lxx. 2430-31).

#### PUNḌRA AND PAUNḌRA.

The Punḍras dwelt in the Eastern region as stated in the description of Bhīma’s Eastern conquests quoted above, though they are also

assigned sometimes to the Southern region (*e.g.*, Markand. Pur., lvii. 45). The name occurs in various other forms, Puṇḍraka (Sabhā-p., iv. 119), Paṇḍra (Ādi-p., clxxxvii. 7020), Paṇḍraka (*id.*, clxxxvi. 6992; and Sabhā-p., xxxiii. 1270) and Paṇḍrika (Sabhā-p., li. 1872). These names are used sometimes as if equivalent, thus, “Famous in the world is the mighty king among the Vaṅgas, Puṇḍras and Kirātas, named the Paṇḍraka Vāsudēva” (*id.*, xiii. 584), and yet a distinction is made between Paṇḍras and Puṇḍras, for they are mentioned separately in the list of peoples in India (Bhīṣma-p., ix. 358 and 365), and Puṇḍras, Puṇḍrakas and Paṇḍrikas are all mentioned in one passage (Sabhā-p., li. 1872-4).

This distinction appears also in the list of kings who attended the opening of the Pāṇḍavas’ Court. Among them are mentioned “Aṅga and Vaṅga with Puṇḍraka, the two kings of Pāṇḍa and Uḍra (*Pāṇḍōḍra-rājau*) with Andhraka” (*id.*, iv. 119). The reading *Pāṇḍa* here seems to be a mistake for *Paṇḍra*, because there is no passage, that I know of, which alludes to any country or people called Pāṇḍa in Eastern India, and because the reading Paṇḍra occurs in the same combination in the list of kings who attended Yudhiṣṭhira’s rāja-sūya sacrifice, *viz.*, *sa-paṇḍrōḍrān*, “with Paṇḍras and Uḍras” (Vana-p., li. 1988). It seems clear then that there was a distinction between Puṇḍras and Puṇḍrakas on the one hand, and Paṇḍras, Paṇḍrakas and Paṇḍrikas on the other; and yet the two people appear to have been but two branches of the same nation, for the Paṇḍraka Vāsudēva was king of the Puṇḍras as stated in the quotation from Sabhā-p., xiii. 584 above. This inference is corroborated in the further passages which are now cited to elucidate their position.

Lassen places Puṇḍra in the northern half of the modern Chutia Nagpur, and does not show Paṇḍra as separate. The passages that I have found which give indications of the position of Puṇḍra and Paṇḍra are these. I will consider Paṇḍra first.

In the two passages last quoted the Paṇḍras are linked with the Uḍras, and the second runs thus—“With Baṅgas and Aṅgas (*sa-baṅ-gāṅgān*), with Paṇḍras and Uḍras (*sa-paṇḍrōḍrān*), with Cōlas, Drāviḍas and Andhrakas (*sa-cōla-drāviḍāndhrakān*).” These three groups denote real territorial proximity. The Cōlas, Drāviḍas and Andhrakas occupied the whole of the east coast of the Dekhan; the Aṅgas and Vaṅgas were near each other; hence it seems certain, the Paṇḍras and Uḍras were neighbours also. The Paṇḍras and Uḍras are placed together in the Bhīṣma-p. list (ix. 365). Uḍra, as will be seen further on, was in the extreme west of West Bengal. Again the Paṇḍras are grouped along with the Utkalas, Mēkalas, Kalingas and Andhras



(Drōṇa-p., iv. 122). The Utkalas were in Chutia Nagpur and the Orissa Tributary States. The Mēkalas were the inhabitants of the Mēkala hills, the modern Mekal hills, which bound Chattisgarh on the west and north. Kalinga has been already defined. Andhra, which is an old name of the Telingas and Telugus, comprised the eastern portion of the Nizam's Dominions and the southern portion of the Central Provinces. The Paṇḍras therefore were connected with the races situated west and south-west of Bengal proper.

The grouping of the Puṇḍras was markedly different. In the first passage cited (Sabhā-p., xiii. 584), they are linked with Vaṅgas and Kirātas. Kirāta was the general name of all the tribes of Mongolian affinity which inhabited the hilly regions from the Panjab to Assam and Chittagong, as will be shewn further on. The Puṇḍras are grouped with the Aṅgas and Vaṅgas in Sabhā-p., iv. 119 cited above. There are other passages which yield no definite information, such as Ādi-p., cxiii. 4453; Sabhā-p., li. 1872-4, and Āṣvamēdh.-p., lxxxii. 2435-65; but the inference appears to be that the Puṇḍras occupied some intermediate position between the Aṅgas and Vaṅgas and the Himālayas.

From these conclusions we may proceed to consider the description of Bhīma's Eastern expedition (Sabhā-p., xxix. 1094-1100) which has been quoted above in relation to Aṅga. As already remarked, it appears unusually clear and natural. Beyond the Monghyr and Bhāgalpur districts reigned two kings who are spoken of together in the dual number as if closely connected. One is called Vāsudēva the mighty king of Puṇḍra, but Vāsudēva is generally spoken of as the king of Paṇḍra, see for instance, besides the passages cited already, Sabhā-p., xxxiii. 1270, and Hari-V., cxvii. 6580-84, and 6606-8. The other king is not named, but Kauṣikī-kaccha where he reigned means the land bordering on the R. Kauṣikī, that is on the east side, because Aṅga lay on the west side; and stretching east of that river is a high tract of stiff red clay known as the Barind. This agrees with the position which has been already indicated for Puṇḍra. Hence it seems unmistakable that the joint kings of Puṇḍra and Paṇḍra are meant. Vāsudēva was properly king of Paṇḍra, but being the chief is spoken of as lord both of Puṇḍra and Paṇḍra, and the other would have been king of Puṇḍra proper. Beyond these kings lay Vaṅga, says the passage.

From all these results it follows that Paṇḍra must have lain on the south side of the Ganges, and Puṇḍra on the north side, between Aṅga and Vaṅga. Paṇḍra must have comprised the modern districts of the Santāl Parganas and Bīrbhūm and the north portion of the Hazāribāgh district; and Puṇḍra the district of Māldah, the portion of Purnia east of the R. Kosi, and part of Dinājpur and Rājshāhi.

From their name, the Paṇḍras were presumably an offshoot of the Puṇḍras; hence it would seem probable that, after the Puṇḍras established themselves in the above-mentioned region north of the Ganges, a branch of them must have crossed that river, pushed their way into the hilly tract of the Santāl Parganas and its outskirts, and formed a sister kingdom under the name of Paṇḍras.

#### SUHMA AND TĀMALIPTA.

The last of the five kindred nations was Suhma. It is mentioned last, but was well-known and was grouped oftenest with Puṇḍra. The evidence to fix its position is clear.

In the account of Bhīma's Eastern conquests (Sabhā-p., xxix) which has been often cited above, the Suhmas and Pra-suhmas are mentioned between Vidēha and Magadha (1089-91), and again Tāmra-lipta, Karvaṭa, Suhma and the sea-coast are named in close succession after Vaṅga (1097-99). In the account of Raghu's conquests it is said—“marching east and subduing various countries, Raghu reached the neighbourhood of the sea which was dark with forests of tallier palms (*tālī-vana*), and the Suhmas submitted to him” (Raghu-V., iv. 34-35). Lastly it is stated plainly in the Daṣa-kumāra-carita that Dāmalipta is a city among the Suhmas (Story of Mitra-gupta).

Dāmalipta is the same as Tāmaliptā. The Tāmaliptas were a well-known people and are often mentioned. This name is written in various ways, viz., Tāmra-lipta, Tāmra-liptaka, Tamōliptī, Tamālikā, and Tamālinī. Prof. Sir M. Monier-Williams treats Tāma-lipta (q. v.) as the proper form of the name, and the others as variations, which seemingly sought to read meanings into it. Tāmra-lipta is, I believe, the form most commonly met with in Sanskrit writings. Their capital was called Tāmra-liptā, Tāmra-liptī, or Tāmra-liptikā, and this name has been corrupted into the modern Tamruk, which is a well-known town near the mouth of the R. Rūpnārāyan in Midnapur.

From these data it appears that Suhma must have comprised the modern districts of Hooghly, Howrah, Bankura and Bardhwan, and the eastern portion of Midnapur. The first of the above allusions to the Suhmas and Pra-suhmas seems to be an error, for there do not appear to be any other references to such people close to Vidēha and Magadha. Perhaps the reading should be Ḥōṇas and Pra-ḥōṇas, which would mean people living near the river Ḥōṇa, the modern Sone; and this suggestion may be compared with the name Ḥāṇavatyas which occurs along with Aṅgas, Vaṅgas, Puṇḍras and Gayas (Sabhā-p., li. 1872), and which seems to be a mistake for Ḥōṇavatyas, as it is not in the dictionary and I have not met with it elsewhere.

According to the passage cited from the Daça-kumāra-carita, Tāmra-lipta or Tāmra-lipta was part of the Suhma territory, but Tāmra-lipta is frequently alluded to as if it were a country by itself, *e.g.*, Ādi-p., clxxxvi. 6993; Sabhā-p., li. 1874; Bhīṣma-p., ix. 364; Drōṇa-p., lxx. 2436 and Karṇa-p., xxii. 863. It would have comprised the modern district of Howrah and the eastern part of Midnapur. In fact Tāmra-lipta appears to occur oftener than Suhma, and this is perhaps because the town Tāmra-liptā was a famous sea-port, especially during the centuries of Buddhist activity.

Another name, which was equivalent to or was included within Tāmralipta, is Vēlā-kūla, “the stream-bank,” or better perhaps, “the sea-shore.” It is said to be the same as the modern town Birkul, which is on the coast in the extreme south of the Midnapur district.

#### UDRA OR ŌDRA.

The Uḍras have been mentioned above in conjunction with the Paṇḍras; otherwise they are, I believe, rarely alluded to in Sanskrit writings. They are also called Ōḍras (Sabhā-p., l. 1843), and Auḍras (Bhīṣma-p., ix. 365), and they are also presumably the Uḍhras of Bhīṣma-p., l. 2084, and the Auḍras of Āçvamēdh.-p., lxxxiii. 2476-7. They have given their name to modern Orissa, *i.e.*, Ōḍra-dēça, and Lassen places them in his map more or less conterminous with Orissa, but this cannot have been their position, because it has been shewn that Kalinga comprised all Orissa except the narrow northern part of the Balasore district, and because the Uḍras play a very insignificant part in the early accounts of Eastern India, quite incompatible with the supposition that they inhabited the fine extensive plain of Orissa; and also because Orissa has not always meant what it denotes now.

The Uriya or Oḍiya language is spoken throughout Orissa and the Ganjam district, in the northern part of the Vizagapatam district and along the south-eastern limits of Chattisgarh (Maltby's Uriya Grammar, Preface)—a peculiarly curved area. A territory of such size and such a shape could hardly have been the ancient home of any tribe, much less of so small a tribe as the Uḍras appear to have been. The allusions to Kalinga leave no doubt about its position, and it will be seen that the Utkalas, who were more important in old times than the Uḍras, probably occupied the northern part of the Balasore district; hence it seems impossible the Uḍras can have inhabited any part of Orissa. In the last century Orissa included the tract of country between the rivers Rūpnārāyan and Subarṇa-rēkhā, which flow through the Midnapur district (see Bengal Administration Report, 1872-73, p. 40); that tract is now part of the Midnapur district and is considered part of Bengal proper.

These considerations give, I think, an indication where the Udra territory was in ancient times. The eastern part of Midnapur belonged to Tāmalipta and Suhma, hence there remains only the western part of that district which no other nation appears to have occupied; and if to this be added the modern district of Mānbhūm, the eastern part of Singhbhūm, and perhaps the southern portion of Bankura, a well-defined tract is obtained, which no other tribe appears to have owned and which bordered on Pauṇḍra. I would suggest that this must have been Udra in ancient times.

If this be a reasonable inference, it discloses how an insignificant early tribe developed and spread during the confusion which prevailed in the dark times of medieval Indian history. I would suggest that the Udras must have pushed southward, over-run the whole of Orissa and Ganjam, and driven the Kalingas downward into the Vizagapatam district, till their further course was checked by the Dravidian powers on the south; then they must have turned westward and forced their way round into the southern portion of Chattisgarh.

#### PRĀG-JYŌTIṢA.

Prāg-jyōtiṣa was a famous kingdom in ancient times and is often mentioned in the Mahā-Bhārata. The references to it are however rather perplexing, for in some passages it is styled a Mlēccha kingdom, in others a Dānava or Asura kingdom, and in others again the allusions seem mixed. These passages may be taken in order.

Prāg-jyōtiṣa is placed in the North region (Vana-p., ccliii. 15240-42), but was also considered to be in the Eastern region (Mārkaṇḍ. Pur., lvii. 44). In the account of Arjuna's conquests it is placed in North India and his course is described thus. After conquering all the kings who dwelt in Çākala-dvīpa and in the seven dvīpas, Arjuna advanced to Prāg-jyōtiṣa. Bhaga-datta was the great king there, and Arjuna had a great conflict with him. The Prāg-jyōtiṣa king was surrounded with Kirātas and Cinas and many other soldiers who dwelt in the marshy regions near the sea, and after a battle lasting eight days submitted amicably to Arjuna. From there Arjuna marched to the North region governed by Kuvēra and conquered Antar-giri and Vahir-giri and Upa-giri (Sabhā-p., xxv. 999-1012). Similarly in the description of Karṇa's conquests it is said he conquered Bhaga-datta and ascended Himavat (Vana-p., ccliii. 15241).

The three names Upa-giri, Antar-giri and Vahir-giri in this place can only denote different tracts in the Himālayas, viz., the southern slopes, the middle valleys and the further region on the north respectively. Bhaga-datta is called Çailālaya, "dwelling among the mountains" (Strī-p., xxiii. 644). It is stated in the foregoing passage and

again in Udyōga-p., xviii. 584-5, that his army was composed of Kirātas and Cīnas. The Kirātas, as will be explained, were the Himalayan tribes of Mongolian affinity, and the Cīnas were the Chinese; as they formed his army, they were his close neighbours. Hence it is clear that Prāg-jyōtiṣa lay in the north-east of India and touched the Himālayas.

But as stated in the above passage from Sabhā-p., Bhaga-datta drew part of his troops also from the people who dwelt in the marshy regions near the sea, *sāgarānūpa* (see also Karṇa-p., v. 104-5); and when he attended Yudhiṣṭhira's rāja-sūya sacrifice, he was accompanied by all the Mlēcchas who lived in the marshy regions near the sea (Sabhā-p., xxxiii. 1268-9). This word can only mean the low alluvial tracts and islands east of Vaṅga, around the mouth of the R. Brahma-putra. That tract was peopled by Mlēcchas as mentioned in the description of Bhīma's Eastern conquests quoted above. It is also stated definitely that Bhaga-datta dwelt at the Eastern Ocean (Udyōga-p., iii. 74). The Brahma-putra till last century flowed round the south side of the Garo hills, and then southward through the districts of Maimansingh and Dacca (Major Rennell's Atlas, 1781). Presumably therefore Prāg-jyōtiṣa stretched southward along both sides of that river as far as the delta, or even perhaps as far as the sea itself.

Lassen places Prāg-jyōtiṣa north of the R. Lōhita or Brahma-putra in Bhutan, but this position does not satisfy the conditions already mentioned. It is implied in the Raghu-Vaṁṣa that Prāg-jyōtiṣa lay east of that river, for, when Raghu returning from Himavat crossed the river, the Prāg-jyōtiṣa king trembled (iv. 81); but I venture to think that Kālidāsa cannot have been entirely right in this allusion to distant geography, because if he is right the whole of North Bengal must be assigned to Puṇḍra, there being no other people of note mentioned who could have occupied all that territory. Puṇḍra, however, hardly plays as important a part in the ancient stories as the possession of so rich and extensive a kingdom would have warranted, and Prāg-jyōtiṣa on the other hand would be relegated to hilly tracts of small fertility east of the old course of the Brahma-putra, whereas the allusions indicate that Bhaga-datta was a wealthy and powerful monarch. But see page 112.

Bhaga-datta is called a "warrior-king" and "the mighty king of the Mlēcchas" (Sabhā-p., l. 1834), and is seldom mentioned without some complimentary epithet. He alone of the northern kings is allowed to have maintained a long and equal contest with Arjuna (Udyōga-p., clxvi. 5805-6). He is dignified with the title "Çiva's friend," and esteemed "not inferior to Çakra in battle" (Sabhā-p., xxv. 1005 and see

Karṇa-p., v. 104). He is also called specially “the friend of Pāṇḍu” (*ibid.*, 1008), and is referred to in terms of respect and kindness by Kṛṣṇa when addressing Yudhiṣṭhira—“Bhaga-datta is thy father’s aged friend; he was noted for his deference to thy father in word and deed, and he is mentally bound by affection and devoted to thee like a father” (*id.*, xiii. 579-80). His Cīna and Kirāta troops glittered as with gold—*tasya cīnaiḥ kirātaiḥ ca kāñcanair iva saṁvṛtam babhau bulam*—unless the allusion be to their yellow complexions (Udyōga-p., xviii. 584-5).

For these reasons it seems that Prāg-jyōtiṣa must have comprised the country along both sides of the Brahma-putra from the Himālayas down to Tippera, that is the modern districts of Jalpaigori, Cooch Behar, Goalpara, Rangpur, Bogra, Maimansingh, Daeca, Tippera, and part of Pabna and also probably part of the east of Nepāl. Strictly speaking, the southern portion of Prāg-jyōtiṣa as thus defined would have fallen within the Eastern region and would have included Lauhitya mentioned in the description of Bhīma’s conquests there quoted above, that is, the country beside the R. Lōhita or Brahma-putra; but if Lauhitya was only a portion of the Prāg-jyōtiṣa realm, and the strength of that realm lay, as it appears it did, in the north, it was natural to treat Prāg-jyōtiṣa as situated in the Northern region.

The region assigned to Prāg-jyōtiṣa bordered on forests and hills where elephants still abound, and where a hardy race of ponies still exists; and the allusions to it notice this. Thus Bhaga-datta is described as “the best wielder of the elephant-hook” among the kings assembled on the Pauravas’ side in the Great War, and as “skilful with the chariot” (Udyōga-p., clxvi. 5804); and it would seem from this that in ancient days kings did not consider it unbecoming to excel in the manège of elephants. He gave as presents to Yudhiṣṭhira “horses of noble breed, swift as the wind, an iron vessel, and swords with fine ivory hilts” (Sabhā-p., l. 1835-6). The description of the horses is, of course, exaggerated according to our ideas, for the best horses in ancient India could not well have exceeded what we should call galloways, and the majority of them could not have been more than ponies.

No name is given to the capital in this class of passages but it is called Prāg-jyōtiṣa in the other classes. The people were Mlēcchas as indicated in some of the foregoing quotations; and this word, no doubt means here people of Mongolian affinity.

The second and third classes of passages occur, I believe, only in connexion with Kṛṣṇa and relate to an attack which he is said to have made on Prāg-jyōtiṣa. In the second class may be quoted first a part of Kṛṣṇa’s denunciation of Çiçu-pāla—“Çiçu-pāla, knowing that we had gone to the Prāg-jyōtiṣa city, set fire to Dvārakā” (Sabhā-p., xlvii.

1567). This almost belongs to the first class, but the idea is developed in a speech by Arjuna in praise of Kṛṣṇa—"Thou didst destroy Muru's fetters (*maurava pāṣa*) and slay Nisunda and Naraka; thou didst render the path to the Prāg-jyōtiṣa city safe again" (Vana-p., xii. 488). Here we see the country Prāg-jyōtiṣa described in the first class of passages disappears and becomes a city, Kṛṣṇa becomes a hero and conqueror, and the suggestion comes in that the people were demons.

This suggestion is fully developed in the third class of passages, and the laudation of Kṛṣṇa grows fulsome and hyperbolical as addressed to a divine personage. Thus Arjuna praising him says—There was a very strong fortress-city called Prāg-jyōtiṣa belonging to the Asuras; and Bhauma Naraka carried off Aditi's two jewelled ear-rings there; the gods could not cope with him, and therefore invoked Kṛṣṇa's help to slay the Dasyus; Kṛṣṇa severed six thousand fetters (*pāṣa*), slew Bhauma Naraka and Mura, and recovered the ear-rings (Udyōga-p., xlvii. 1887-92). Viṣṇu prophesying about his incarnations says—While dwelling at Dvārakā as Kṛṣṇa, I shall slay Naraka Bhauma, who did wrong to Aditi, and also Maru and Piṭha the Dānava, and destroy the charming Prāg-jyōtiṣa city filled with all kinds of wealth (Ṣānti-p., cccxli. 12954-6). Vidura says—Naraka and the Dānavas tried to seize Kṛṣṇa, when he went to Prāg-jyōtiṣa, and failed (Udyōga-p., cxxix. 4408-9).

This class of allusions occurs especially in the Hari-Vaṁṣa. It is said there—Kṛṣṇa went to the Prāg-jyōtiṣa city and killed the Dānava Naraka in the sea, *samudra-madhye* (clxxiv. 9790). Nārada speaking of Kṛṣṇa's exploits says—The two Dānavas Maya and Tāra delighted in Bhauma Naraka's city Prāg-jyōtiṣa (lv. 3116-7). It is said Naraka Bhauma, king of the Dānavas, seized Tvaṣṭṛ's daughter Kaṣṭhī; he was king of Prāg-jyōtiṣa; he made a fine city Maṇi-parvata for the Gandharva maidens and Apsarases, whom he carried off, upon the Alakā towards his own country of Muru—*Alakāyām muroḥ sva-viṣayam prati* (cxxi. 6791-6801). The Alakā seems to be the river Alaka-nandā, one of the eastern sources of the Ganges, but Muru seems to be generally the name of a Dānava prince. The climax of marvel is perhaps reached in the continuation of that story in Hari-V., cxxi to cxxiii, where Kṛṣṇa's exploits are described at great length—how at Indra's request he rode on Garuḍa from Dvārakā to the Prāg-jyōtiṣa city, how he fought in a superhuman battle with Naraka's four wardens (*dvāra-pāla*), with the hosts of Daityas, Dānavas and Rākṣasas and finally with Naraka, and slew them all, how he captured the city with its fabulous riches, and how the Earth gave up Aditi's ear-rings which Naraka had carried off. It was through this great victory that Kṛṣṇa gained his wonderful bow Ṣārṅga (Udyōga-p., clvii. 5353-8).

To the same class of passages belongs the allusion in a doubtful verse of the Rāmāyaṇa, where Prāg-jyōtiṣa is mistakenly placed in the *Western* region—“A city made of gold called Prāg-jyōtiṣa is there ; in it dwells the evil-souled Dānava called Naraka” (Gorresio’s Edition, Annotations to Kiṣk-k., xliii).

The difference which has taken place in the aspect of Prāg-jyōtiṣa from the first to the last of these passages is most striking. We have no longer a prosperous Mlēccha kingdom of barbaric splendour, but a nation of Asuras and Dānavas ; no longer the noble and imposing figure of the warrior-king Bhaga-datta, the ally and friend of the Kurus, and the friend of Çiva, but malignant demon-kings Naraka and Muru, who were the foes of the gods and with whom the divine hero Kṛṣṇa could have nothing but internecine war. There can be, no doubt, that this change marks very clearly the development of the Kṛṣṇa legend, from his rise as a new chieftain of great vigour and capacity to his deification as an incarnation of Viṣṇu.

There is only one other passage of importance that I am aware of, *viz.*, Rāmāy., Ādi-k., xxxv. 1-9, which has been quoted above in connexion with Magadha. It says Prāg-jyōtiṣa was founded by Amūrta-rajās, a son of a great king Kuça, who was apparently an Ārya king in Madhya-dēça. It does not agree with any allusion that I have found, and can hardly be reconciled with any of the passages already discussed.

A few words may be added about Kāma-rūpa, which is the modern district of Kamrup or Gauhaṭi in Assam. The Kāma-rūpas were not an ancient nation, for their name does not occur, as far as I am aware, in the Mahā-Bhārata or Rāmāyaṇa or any early Sanskrit work ; in fact they are rarely mentioned. They seem therefore to have sprung up only in medieval times, and to have developed as Prāg-jyōtiṣa had dwindled into a small state. Thus they are mentioned in the Raghuvamça (iv. 83-84), where it is said Raghu conquered them after the Prāg-jyōtiṣas, so that they were distinct from the latter. In ancient times their territory was probably included within Prāg-jyōtiṣa.

#### THE KIRĀTAS.

The word Kirāta is, no doubt, the same as the modern names Kirāti and Kirānti, which mean “a native of the Kirānt-des or mountainous country lying between the Dud-Kosi and the Karki rivers in Nepal. The term includes the Khambu, Limbu and Yākhā tribes ; and the Danuār, Hayu and Thāmi also claim to be Kirānti ;” but their claim is disputed by the first three tribes which are superior (Risley’s Castes and Tribes of Bengal, I. 490). But formerly they had a much larger



range, or their name was used in a comprehensive way, for it was applied to tribes inhabiting the Himālaya range and its southern slopes from the Panjab to Assam and Chittagong.

Arjuna in the course of his conquests in the Northern region encountered Kirātas in the army of Bhaga-datta king of Prāg-jyōtiṣa (Sabhā-p., xxv. 1002; and see other passages cited below). Bhīma, after vanquishing Vidēha in his Eastern expedition, proceeded from there against the Kirātas (*id.*, xxix. 1089); and they were even further to the east (*id.*, xiii. 584). They are spoken of as dwelling in the marshy regions near the sea (*sāgarānūpa-vāsin*) under Bhaga-datta's rule (Kaṛṇa-p., v. 104-5), that is, as explained in discussing Prāg-jyōtiṣa, in the low lands around the mouth of the Brahma-putra, so that they occupied all the eastern bounds of Bengal. Moreover Nakula in his Western expedition is said in general terms to have encountered Kirātas along with Pahlavas (Persians), Barbaras, Yavanas (Greeks), and Çakas (Scythians), (Sabhā-p., xxxi. 1199); and they are classed with those and other north-western nations (Çānti-p., lxv. 2429, and ccvii. 7560; and Vana-p., li. 1990).

The Kirātas formed a series of allied yet distinct tribes or clans, for the Kirātas are mentioned twice in the Bhīṣma-P. list (ix. 358 and 364), and again "all the Kirātas" are mentioned (*ibid.*, 376); and it is almost impossible that tribes so wide-spread could have been homogeneous. They were also intermixed with similar hill tribes called Tanguṇas and Pulindas, and all appear to have lived together amicably (Vana-p., cxl. 10863-6). They dwelt in the fastnesses of Himavat (Drōṇa-p., iv. 121; and Raghu-Vaṃça, iv. 76), and their chief territory was among the ranges of Kailāsa, Mandara and Haima, that is, the region around lake Mānasa, the modern Manasarowar lakes (Anuçās.-p., xix. 1434; Vana-p., cxxxix. and cxl). It was there that the great king Su-bāhu resided, who is called king of the Pulindas (*ibid.*) and also king of the Kirātas (Vana-p., clxxvii. 12349).

In that region they formed a settled kingdom and had a city (*ibid.* 12350). Eastwards they were also organized into chieftainships, for Bhīma conquered seven kings of the Kirātas on the confines of Vidēha (Sabhā-p., xxix. 1089). But the various tribes differed much in material condition, for some were civilized and open to friendly intercourse (Vana-p., cxl. 10865-6; and Udyōga-p., lxiii. 2470), and others were clad in skins, lived on fruit and roots and were cruel (Sabhā-p., li. 1865). Their women were used as slaves, for large numbers of Kirāta slave-girls are said to have been presented to Yudhiṣṭhira (*ibid.* 1867). The Rāmāyaṇa describes the Kirātas as wearing thick top-knots (Kiṣk.-k., xl. 30). They were looked upon with comprehensive disap-

proval, for they are called wicked and are said to have followed evil customs (Çānti-p., ccvii. 7560-61). Manu declares they were kṣattriyas and became degraded because of the extinction of sacred rites and the absence of brahmans (x. 43 and 44); but this appears to be the opinion of a rather late age, for there does not seem to be any indication that the Kirātas ever set much store by those privileges.

Considering their position and their affinities, it seems clear the Kirātas were tribes of the Mongolian family.

#### UTKALA.

The Utkalas were well-known, though not mentioned often in the Mahā-Bhārata. They are linked with the Mēkalas (Bhīṣma-p., ix. 348; Drōṇa-p., iv. 122; and Rāmāy., Kiṣk.-k., xli. 14), and with the Mēkalas and Kāliṅgas (Karna-p., xxii. 882). The position of Kāliṅga has been explained. The Mēkalas inhabited the Mekal hills in the west and north of Chattisgarh. The Utkalas must therefore have occupied an intermediate position. From the passage quoted from the Raghu-Vaṁṣa with reference to Kāliṅga, it appears the Utkala territory stretched nearly as far as the R. Kapiçā or Cossye in Midnapur; that passage does not mean it reached that river, for it was only after he crossed that river that Raghu had occasion to accept the guidance of the Utkala kings. From these data and the positions assigned to Paundra and Ōdra, it may be inferred that Utkala comprised the hilly tracts from Balasore to Lohārdagā and Sarguja.

The Utkalas were a hill tribe of rude habits. They stood by themselves and were not considered to have any close affinities with the races around them, except probably the Mēkalas, because their origin was thrown back to the fabulous times of Ilā (Hari-V., x. 631-2); hence they seem to have been an aboriginal race. According to the Raghu-Vaṁṣa which speaks of the Utkala kings (*loc. cit.*), they must have consisted of a number of clans, each governed by its own chieftain.

Various derivations have been suggested of the name Utkala, but it is worthy of note that Utkala and Mēkala are linked together as if the two words possessed some element in common. These two tribes must apparently from their situation have been Kolarian tribes. Can it be that the termination in both names is to be identified with the word *Kol*?

#### GENERAL REMARKS.

In conclusion some conjectures may be put forward which the foregoing results tend to suggest.

The character of the four groups of nations may be summed up thus. Magadha, Vidēha and Vaiçāli seem to have been the outposts of Aryan conquest and colonization. Anṅa, Vanṅa, Kalinga, Puṇḍra and Sūhma with Tāmalipta and Ōḍra were kindred nations, which were not of Aryan stock and were not subjugated by the Āryas, but passed under Aryan influences and became Aryanized. Prāg-jyōtiṣa was a nation of Mongolian extraction. Utkala was a congeries of Kolarian tribes occupying the hilly tracts where they are still found.

I venture to suggest that we have here the results of the immigration of four different races.

The Utkalas, being so-called aboriginal tribes, must of course have come into this region first; and their position among hills also suggests the same inference. They must have been driven into the hills by later invaders.

Next probably came the Anṅas and their kindred nations. It seems most probable that they entered India from the Bay of Bengal, for their condition does not agree with the theory, that they were in the Ganges plain before and were driven eastward by the advancing Āryas. What happened in North America illustrates what we should expect to find, when one race invades and conquers others and takes possession of their territory on a large scale. As the pale-faces multiplied and forced their way westward, each tribe of Red Indians was broken and flung on the tribes behind it, and the tribes became involved in seething confusion. But nothing of that kind is to be perceived in the accounts of Anṅa and its kindred nations. On the other hand their possession of all the Ganges delta, their extension up the Ganges basin narrowing at their furthest limit, their spread along the Orissa sea-board, their occupation of the plains and their slight penetration into the hills—all these facts suggest that these nations came from the sea, settled on the sea-coast and gradually carved out kingdoms inland. And if their names are not really derived from the alleged eponymous brothers but perpetuate original appellations, no doubt the termination of the names Anṅa, Vanṅa and Kalinga contains some common meaning.

Third came the invasion of the Prāg-jyōtiṣas. This seems the most probable order, because they did not push their way so far into India as the Anṅas, &c., and because all the accounts make them out to have been a powerful nation from the earliest times, which would hardly have been their condition, if they had preceded the Anṅas, &c., and been driven back towards the hills by them. They must have descended from the Mongolian table-lands through the passes along the north-east. They held a strong position in ancient times, but gra-

dually disappeared so completely that no trace of their name, which is a singular one, seems to be discoverable. If, however, Kālidāsa is right in the passage quoted in page 105, it indicates how Prāg-jyōtiṣa was dwindling away in his time. Pressed by the Puṇḍras on the west, by the Vangas on the south, by the new Kāma-rūpas on the north-east, and probably by fresh Mongolian tribes on the north, the Prāg-jyōtiṣas were forced to retreat to the east side of the Brahma-putra, into the Garo and Khasi hills and into the district of Sylhet; and it is probably in that direction that the kingdom must have perished.

Lastly came the invasion of the Āryas into Eastern India. Their conquering vigour seems to have spent itself by the time they subdued Vidēha and Magadha, for they had already passed through many generations in the plains of North India, and the enervating climate and easy conditions of life had surely, if slowly, modified the constitution which their ancestors had acquired in colder and hardier climes.

---